15th July 1953] [Sri K. Kotra Basavana Goud]

ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಕೇಳುವ ಈ ಮೂರು ಫಿರ್ಕಾಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡೆ 60 ಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜನರು, 30% ಕಡಮೆ ತೆಲುಗರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಟೌನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ floating population ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಸಮವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿದ್ದೂ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಮೂರು ಫಿರ್ಕಾಗಳು (ಮೋಕ, ರೂಪನ ಗುಡಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ) ನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸ ಬೇಕಾ ಯಿಲ್ಲವೆ Plebiscite ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುವ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಹ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೋಟಿ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ M. L. A. ಗಳೂ ಆ ಮೂರು ಫಿರ್ಕಾಗಳನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾದರೆ 2 ನೇ ಕುರುಕ್ಷೇತ್ರವು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಬಹು ಆಕ್ರೋಶವೂ ಮತ್ತು ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವೂ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುಳ್ಳ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳು ಇಂಥ ಅಸಂಭವವಾದ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆಡಿದ ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶ ವೇನೆಂದು ಅರಿವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಉಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ಖಂಡಿಸುವೆನು. 2 ನೇ ಕುರುಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ನಡೆಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಹೇಡಿಗಳೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿರುವರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿರುವರೋ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಹಾಸ್ಯಾಸ್ಪದ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹಿಂತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಉಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ T. B. Project ನ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ 10-20 ಸಾವಿರ ಮಂದಿ ತೆಲುಗರೂ, ಅರವರೂ ಸಹ ಬಂದು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಬಹು ಅಸಂಭವವಾದವುಗಳು. ಪ್ರಾಂತ ರಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಕ್ಕೇನೇ ಇಷ್ಟು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಆಶೆಯಿಂದ ನೀತಿ, ರೀತಿ ಧರ್ಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೊರೆದುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಅಂಧಾವಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಸತ್ಯ, ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಮರೆತಿರುವರು. ಇಂಥ ದುರ್ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಶುಭವು ದೊರೆಯ ಲಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಂಕೋಚ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಆಂಧ್ರರ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಬೇಡ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಆಂಧ್ರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಗೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಧ್ಯೇಯ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದಾದರು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಅವರ ಹೊಸ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಶುಭಾಶಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲಿ.

"ನಮ್ಮ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷದ ಮಳೆಯ ಅಭಾವದಿಂದ ಫಲಗಳು ಕೈಸೇರದೆಯಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರೆಮಿಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ರೂ. 5 ರಿಂದ ರೂ 100 ವರೆಗೆ ರೆಮಿಷನ್ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ರೆಮಿಷನ್‌ನಿಂದ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದೊ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಕಷ್ಟಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೈರಶೀಜನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದು ಬಹು ತಪ್ಪು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಅವಧಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವೆನು.

"ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೊಸ Loan float ಮಾಡುವರೆಂದೂ ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಲೋನನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಬಾರದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ನಮಗೆ ಹೊಸ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಭರವಸೆಯಿದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

"ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳಿಂದ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವೆನು."

VII.—HALF-HOUR DEBATE *RE* TAKING OVER OF THE MADRAS ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS.

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let us now take up the half-hour debate. Two hon. Members want to take part in the debate. Hon. Ministers, Sri Sankara Reddi and Dr. Krishna Rao will reply to the debate. I have allowed ten minutes for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, five minutes for Sri Kalyanasundaram, ten minutes for the Hon. Minister Dr. U. Krishna Rao and five minutes for Hon. Sri N. Sankara Reddi." 6 p m.

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—" Hon. Members from this side may also be allowed to take part in the debate."

MR. SPEAKER :—" This debate is only for half an hour. How can I divide the time among a large number of hon. Members."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I take up the subject of the debate, it pains me very much to bring to the notice of this House that just now we have heard that there has been a shooting in Tuticorin to-day in which three people were killed and possibly many more people are lying in the hospital. (Interruption.) I am not discussing the question but I am only referring to the fact that there was shooting there. I propose to give notice of an adjournment motion to-morrow and I am now just mentioning this fact in order that the Hon. Leader of the House may have sufficient notice and gather the material, so that later on it may not be said that this has been brought before the Government suddenly and that there are no materials before them. I do not want that such a defence should be put up."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Still we have to get information."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, there is time enough between now and to-morrow morning to get the materials from the Officers. In fact to-day the Government possess tremendous resources. They have conveniences to obtain information, they have got telephones and trunk telephones operating to-day. Therefore it should be possible for them to get the necessary materials.

" Now, Sir, I come to the question of the tramways. I must say the Government have entirely bungled over the whole affair. I would even go to the extent of saying that their bungling amounts to criminality because here is a case where the interests of nearly millions of people of the Madras City are involved. The tramways have always provided a cheap method of conveyance, far cheaper than the bus services. In a service like that where the company has been operating under a monopoly licence, a licence which is not open to other people, that monopoly concern has a certain responsibility to discharge towards the public of Madras City. The company when it gets a monopoly control has added responsibility as far as the public is concerned. But here is a monopoly company which suddenly came out with a decision to close the service and put the millions of people of Madras City into terrific hardship. What is that the Government has been doing in this respect? Has the Government discharged their responsibility towards the public? If the textile workers go on a strike, the Government have been coming out in season and out of season with the excuse that they are public utility services and therefore the workers shall not go on strike and stop production. Production is more important, they said. If in these public utility services the workers go on strike, they shoot the workers down, they lathi charge them and arrest them. All these things are common things

15th July 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

as far as common people are concerned. But here is a management, a British management. We are told that after 15th August 1947 the British Government has quitted the country. But it appears as far as the management are concerned the management still continue to think that they are the rulers of the country and not the elected representatives and the Government created by the elected representatives of the country.

" The position in regard to this matter is this. On the 12th November 1952 the management wrote to the Hon. Minister for Labour and Industries that they wanted immediately to retrench some people and put forward certain proposals. On the 19th December 1952—I may be wrong with regard to dates—that management addressed a letter to the Hon. Chief Minister saying that unless the Government helped them to retrench a number of people, they would be compelled to immediately close down the show. Therefore, the Government had had clear four months' notice of the intentions of the management as early as 19th December 1952. The Hon. the Chief Minister had a letter from the management in which it had threatened that the tramway service would be closed down unless it was enabled to retrench people. Later on the Government referred the matter to the Industrial Tribunal which is constituted under the law of the land, under the law enacted by the elected representatives of the people of this country. Even before that Tribunal went into the whole question whether the demand of the management to retrench a certain number of workers under the circumstances, was justified and gave its award, this management in order to see that the Industrial Tribunal's award is nullified and in order to circumvent the law of the land, comes forward suddendly with the decision to close down. They took to all sorts of subterfuges. The people of this State are already conversant with the various subterfuges adopted by the management, how Mr. Brookes suddenly became a Receiver of the Debenture Holders from a Director of the Company. All these things we know. Therefore here is a company which thinks that the laws of the country are nothing, that the sovereignty of the people is nothing, that the advice of the Government of the country is nothing, that the advice of the Hon. the Chief Minister is nothing. As far as they are concerned they will have their own way. They are determined to retrench the workers and if the Government did not allow them to retrench the workers, to close down the factory. Sir, I am not here bothered about the inconvenience and hardship caused to the millions of the people in the City of Madras. I am concerned with the attitude of the management. What is the attitude adopted by the Government now towards the management? They have the Preventive Detention Act. We would be detained, hundreds of people in the State may be detained under that Act. On what grounds? If the Government or somebody in authority suspects that some one is about to act in a manner prejudicial to public service he can be detained. All these are there. And here is a management which not only has got the intention to stop public services, but actually stopped the

public services. What is the action that the Government takes in this case? A simple prosecution under the Industrial Disputes Act. For this the gentleman is fined a magnificent sum of Rs. 500. Here is a man who flouts the entire law of the country, does not care for the inconvenience caused to the millions of people in the City of Madras, and that man is punished with a fine of Rs. 500. This is justice! Whereas if an ordinary worker disobeys the law, he is sent to jail. Even under the same Act he can be sent to jail. I can quote hundreds of instances. If workers disobeyed the law they are arrested. Bail is not granted to them. But in the case of the white British Manager, because he is white how could he be arrested, how could he be hurt? He should not be arrested. I ask why not the Government serve warrant on him and arrest him and send him to jail? This unfortunately is the position. What prevented the Government from having recourse to more drastic steps?

"Let us leave that alone. What we are most concerned with is the question: 'What steps have the Government taken in order to see that the Tram services is run?' Let us leave alone the question of the hardship caused to the two thousand workers. Let us leave the question of unemployment alone. Let us argue from the point of view of the inconvenience caused to the millions of people in the City of Madras. Of course, the Government have provided additional bus service. But we all know the congestion in the bus service. A number of buses are breaking down due to overcrowding. Government cannot cope with the overcrowding in buses. As a result thousands and thousands of people are suffering in the City of Madras for want of a cheap mode of conveyance. The Government cannot make conveyance by bus cheap. That being so, I ask what prevented the Government from taking over the management of the Tramway Company and running it themselves? They owe it as a responsibility to the public of Madras City. It is a most elementary duty of the Government to see to it that the residents of the metropolitan City of the State are provided with elementary conveniences necessary for carrying on their day-to-day activities. What is it that prevented the Government from taking over the management of the company? We need not get into the question of compensation to be paid to the company and all that, now. After all the Central Parliament very recently enacted a legislation known as the Industries Control Act. We know that it provides for the taking over of industries even without going into the question of compensation where the industry concerned threatened to close down. Here is a public utility concern of immense importance which has suddenly stopped functioning. In this case what prevented the Government from having recourse to some provision of the law or issuing an ordinance even? There is nothing preventing the Government from doing it. After doing that, if they had come before the legislature they would have had the sanction of the House for taking over the company, and enact necessary laws, for keeping the trams running. The excuse of the Government is that the Tramway Company may not probably pay. I would like to point out that the Tramway Company is paying in Bombay, in Calcutta,

15th July 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

where the fares are far less than in Madras, where they have been declaring dividends after dividends year after year and where the wages paid to the workers are far higher than here, where the dearness allowance paid is also far higher than in Madras. They are flourishing there. It is not at all a fact that the Company here has been running at a loss.

"There is mismanagement by the Company and why should the workers and the people of Madras suffer on that account? If the Government really want to go into the whole question, let them appoint a committee, not a committee of officials. Let us have representatives also from the Trade Unions on the committee. Let the Trade Unions be given responsibility. To say that the Trade Unions have not taken up responsibility without actually giving them any responsibility does not mean anything. Let them be given responsibility of seeing to it that there are no losses and economies are effected. If responsibility is given, the Trade Unions will then come forward to take over that. Today, it is possible to run the Tramway without loss. It is the duty of the Government to take over and run the Tramway service and thus provide a cheap mode of conveyance for the people of the City of Madras." 6-10 p.m.

Sri M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த டிராம், நிர்வாகத்தைப் பற்றி நாமும், பொது மக்களும் நன்கு அறிவோம். பொதுவாக அதைப்பற்றி இரண்டு வகையான அபிப்பிராயம் இருந்து வருகின்றன. சர்க்காரின் தனிப்பட்ட அபிப்பிராயம், டிராம்வே தொழிலாளர்களின் அபிப்பிராயம், டிராம்வே நிர்வாகிகளின் அபிப்பிராயம், ஆகிய எல்லாவற்றையும் பற்றி எனக்கு முன் பேசிய தோழர் ஸ்ரீ P. ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் அழகாகச்சொன்னார். டிராம்வே தொழிலாளர்களின் யூனியனின் அபிப்பிராயம் பிரதிபலிக்கும்படியாகவும், தொழிற்சங்கக் கண்ணோட்டத்துடனும் அவர்கள் பேசினார்கள். தொழிற்சங்கத்தின் அபிப்பிராயத்தையோ, யோசனைகளையோ டிராம்வே நிர்வாகிகள் ஏற்கத் தயாராக இல்லை. ஆனால் இன்றைய தினம் தொழிற் சங்கமே டிராம்வே நிர்வாகத்தை ஏற்று நடத்தத் தயாராக இருக்கிறது. டிராம் வேஸர்விஸை நிறுத்தியதினால் சுமார் 1,500 பேர்களுக்கு மேல் வேலை இழந்து சாப்பாட்டிற்குக் கூட வசதியில்லாமல் தவிக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் குடும்பம் ரொம்பவும் தவிக்கிறது. அவர்கள் குடும்பங்கள் பட்டினி கிடந்து பரிதவிப்பது ஒரு புறம் இருக்க, சென்னைப் பட்டிணத்திலுள்ள நடுத்தர உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களும், தொழிலாளர்களும் மற்ற இதர மக்களும் ரொம்பவும் போக்குவரத்து வசதியின்றி தவிக்கின்றார்கள். அவர்கள் ஒவ்வொரு நாளும் மிகுதியான கட்டணம் கொடுத்து அரசாங்க பஸ்ஸில் பிரயாணம் செய்ய வசதியற்றவர்கள். ஆகவே சர்க்கார் இந்த டிராம் ஸர்விஸை மறுபடியும் ஆரம்பிக்க துரிதமான நடவடிக்கையை எடுக்கவேண்டும். ஏதோ ஆலோசனை செய்து வருவதாகச் சொல்லுகிறார்களே, அதையும் துரிதப் படுத்தி சீக்கிரம் ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வந்தாகவேண்டும். அதற்குத் தக்க நடவடிக்கையை எடுக்க ஒரு கமிட்டியைப் போட்டு, இந்த சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்கள் சார்பில் பிரதிநிதிகளும், தொழிலாளர்கள் சார்பில் பிரதிநிதிகளும், சர்க்கார் சார்பில் பிரதிநிதிகளும், டிராம்வே நிர்வாகிகள் சார்பில் பிரதிநிதிகளும், சென்னைக் கார்ப்பரேஷன் சார்பில் பிரதிநிதிகளும் அடங்கிய ஒரு கமிட்டியை உடனே நியமித்து அதற்குத் தக்கபடி யோசனை செய்து ஒரு முடிவு காண வசதி செய்தாகவேண்டும். தொழிலாளர்களே இதை எடுத்து நஷ்டம் இல்லாமல் நடத்திக் கொடுக்கத் தயாராக இருக்கிறார்கள். உறுதி கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதைப் பொது மக்களும் வரவேற்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே தொழிலாளர்களின்

பிரச்னையைத் தீர்க்கவும், பொது மக்களின் கஷ்டத்தைப்போக்கவும், சர்க்கார் இது விஷயத்தில் சீக்கிரம் ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டு என் பேச்சை நான் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for having given me an opportunity to explain the difficulties under which we have been working for the last few days. Mr. Ramamurthi has given us categorically and perhaps correctly the history of the genesis and development of the differences between the Tramway Company and its workers. It is true that in November last the Company raised the question of retrenchment of some of its workers on the ground that it was working at a loss of nearly Rs. 30,000 a month, and that unless retrenchment was effected, the Tramway Company could not work for long. The matter had to be decided. Of course, the only solution the Government had then was to refer it to the Industrial Tribunal to whom was left the question of solving whether retrenchment was necessary, whether the Company was working at a loss and if it was working at a loss, whether retrenchment of people who had attained their 55th year and those who had put in 30 years' of service, was justified. While this was being investigated the Tramway Company put in a further petition before the Industrial Tribunal asking for the retrenchment of 300 workers and the Tribunal sanctioned the retrenchment of 130 people. It is true that while this industrial dispute was pending, while the award was in force, the company closed down the company and told the Government that it was incurring loss and could not work. The only solution left to us was to await the decision of the Tribunal before whom there was a requisition for retrenchment of the people. While this was being done, the company closed down. That was an offence under section 33, and a violation of the law. According to the law the maximum punishment that could be inflicted is imprisonment for one month and a fine of a thousand rupees. But the magistrate, whose decision we cannot question either here or elsewhere, thought it fit to punish him with a fine of Rs. 500. I can only tell Mr. Ramamurthi that Government were not afraid in prosecuting a white man; nor is it that they wanted to help a white man. It was just to prove to the world that we did not make such a difference, we prosecuted him and the end was justified and we tried to see whether he was justified in closing the company. Unfortunately, the decision of the Tribunal has been against the workers. The Tribunal decided that the Company was closed down due to loss. Therefore, it cannot be called a lock-out. Anyway I am not here to speak on that and Mr. Ramamurthi is not questioning that, I suppose. The concerned workers will file an appeal; I am told they are filing an appeal with the Appellate Tribunal against the award of the Industrial Tribunal. But as he says, it will take time.

" What exactly are we going to do, I must say on this occasion. Mr. Ramamurthi painted a very gloomy picture of the queues and spoke about the inadequacy of the Government Bus Transport. I can straightaway tell him that I have personally visited these

15th July 1953] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

queues more than once and am going round the City practically every day and I can assure him that the queues are not as long as they are reported to be. I have myself stood in the queue and found that the longest queue was at Luz. I was able to get into the bus within 15 minutes. I can only say that the general public opinion is that the Government have tackled this very difficult situation fairly creditably and they are also happy that the rickety trams have not been seen for more than three months. Statistics have shown that there have been far fewer accidents these three months in the history of the Madras City. I can straightway say that I differ very much from Mr. Ramamurthi. If a vote is taken today in the City of Madras, I won't be surprised if the votes are in favour of non-continuance of the trams and for the continuance of the buses. I am fairly certain that I will win on that issue.

"I tried my best and am still hopeful of an amicable settlement of the dispute. There is no doubt that the tram is a cheap method of travel, in the sense that 22 to 25 thousand people, I understand, were buying season tickets at Rs. 3-8-0, Rs. 5 and Rs. 7. We are also issuing season tickets, but they are costly. I do not deny it. The second fact is that more than 1,600 workers will be out of employment. It is true that the Government may be able to absorb 150 or 200 of them in their transport and absorb the rest of them, or at least a fraction of them, in other institutions. But I must say that more than a thousand people will be out of work. That is the only reason for Government trying their very best to negotiate an amicable settlement.

"Now Mr. Ramamurthi suggested that we should take over the Tramway and we should run it. I can straightaway tell him that in 1951 there was a committee appointed by the previous Government consisting of the Chief Engineer of Electricity, the Transport Commissioner and the Transport Engineer, Bombay Electrical and Tramway Company. They made investigation into the conditions of the Madras Tramway and they came to the conclusion that even if it was given free it would not be advisable for this Government to take them over. When I was in the Corporation in 1948, attempts were made to take over this Tramway. But our Engineers gave us a report which was not very favourable. I can tell Mr. Ramamurthi that if to-day we are to take over the Tramway in its present conditions, we will have to pay Rs. 50 lakhs as the cost of the tramway and we will have to spend more than Rs. 8 lakhs to start them and we will have to spend Rs. 20 or 30 lakhs further renovating the outmoded trams and repairing the rickety. I am sure that the expenses that this Government will have to incur will be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 30–40 lakhs. We should see whether it is worthwhile spending so much money on a transport which all over over the world is considered outmoded. In London, trams are going away. My friend said that in Bombay they are making a profit. I was in Bombay recently and I know it is not making a profit. In Bombay the B.E.S.T. is sucessfully tackling because the Tramway Electricity

and Bus systems are run together by one organization and what that company loses in tramways, it gains in electricity. In Calcutta, we know the agitation going on now. The Tramways asked for more fare, they have doubled the fare of second-class. The public protested against this. If Calcutta Tramways which are supposed to be the best in the Far-East and the most efficient should run at a loss . . . "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I would like to inform the Hon. Minister that the Tramway Company in Calcutta has never made a statement that they are running at a loss. I would refer to the statement of the Chief Minister of Bengal wherein he had stated that a quarter anna increase is necessary for building up a fund for buying over the company 20 years after in 1976. This is a specific statement. The Tramway Company has never come forward to say that there was loss in Calcutta."

6-20 p.m. *THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" As I said, even in Calcutta when there was a suggestion to increase the fares, there had been a lot of agitation and protests. But the fact remains that the company there had a desire to increase the fares. Similarly we too may have some difficulties. Now the question is whether this Government can at this stage afford to spend about Rs. 40·0 lakhs on the Tramways. I cannot speak with authority, but I am fairly certain that my colleague the Finance Minister will not be able to spare that amount and we do not know whether we will be justified in spending such a large amount. I can only say this much that negotiations are now being carried on between the Corporation and the Tramways and we will have to await the result of these negotiations. I understand the Mayor has appointed a seven-man committee to go into the question and we can only hope that the negotiations will succeed. But if they do not, I can assure Mr. Ramamurthi that the interests of the cheap travelling public and interest of the 1,600 workers are uppermost in the minds of Government and we will do our best to see that they are not let down. At the same time I must say that financial considerations must weigh in these difficult days and we cannot fritter away Rs. 40·0 lakhs to go to the rescue of a concern which on all hands has been accepted as a losing concern. I can also tell Mr. Ramamurthi that the books of the company were produced before the labour learers Mr. Mohan Kumaramangalam and Mr. Venkataraman and they were convinced that the company was a losing concern and they also agreed that retrenchment was absolutely necessary. But the difference was as to what exactly the number of workers that should be retrenched. Somebody was mentioning that it was 305 and somebody was mentioning that it was 514. But the fact remains that even the labour leaders had to agree that the present condition is not satisfactory and that the company cannot run without some retrenchment. If the labour leaders themselves will agree to that, I must say that nobody should suspect the correctness of the statement. I can only say that so far as we are concerned it is a financial responsibility.

15th July 1953] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

But I wish to say that we shall do our best to solve the problem as beneficiently to the workers and to the citizens of Madras as possible. I am afraid Mr. Ramamurthi's suggestion that we should take over the company at all risks and without paying any compensation and without involving ourselves in any liability is a matter which may not be possible under the existing laws unless we create a new set of laws which will sanction such drastic measures. As I said, under the existing laws I do not think we have the power to do what Mr. Ramamurthi said. It is true we may take over the company as a public utility concern. But who is to bear the loss? There is no doubt there is loss and we have to bear the loss. When any concern takes over another concern, it takes it over with guaranteed losses and does Mr. Ramamurthi want us to take over the Tramways with all the commitments which require not only very careful consideration, but perhaps very serious consideration. I therefore feel that Mr. Ramamurthi would not be justified in accusing this Government of having neglected the interests of the workers and the citizens of Madras or being partial to the white man and not attending to the needs and requirements of labour."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" On a point of personal explanation, Sir. The Hon. Minister for Industries and Labour referred to certain alleged statements made by certain labour leaders who are unfortunately not here. The fact of the matter as far as I know is that on the face of the books shown by the management it is a loss. But there are hundreds of ways of practising economies. There is lot of mismanagement and the workers' leaders have undertaken to carry out these economies provided they are entrusted with the responsibility and are trusted. The Government will not trust the workers. Therefore, to attribute this statement to the labour leaders who are not here is very unfair."

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is really amusing to hear the charge that the Government were sleeping over the matter of the sudden stoppage of trams, the inconvenience caused to the workers because they were thrown out of employment and to the travelling public. I think the hon. Members must be aware that the management and the Receiver were all prosecuted and duly punished in a court of law.

" Now, Sir, the suggestion is that the Government should have immediately stepped in and taken over the Tramways and run it. But the Government as long ago as 1951 set up an expert committee which examined all aspects and made some recommendations. The recommendations were that the present Tramways and its property cost very little, practically nothing and if anyone took it over it would be a very heavily losing concern. The fact is there that because the company was losing to a tune of Rs. 6·0 lakhs every year, they had to close it down. I think no Government would take over such an outmoded system of conveyance like the trams. But the company could have given time to the Government to make alternative arrangements at least. The

Government asked the company to give proper notice and run the trams for another week or ten days. Even that the company did not do and finally the management and the Receiver were prosecuted and punished. The Government also have been doing their best to give an alternative transport by providing more buses and in fact even lorries have been converted into buses. I think with a few more additional buses the inconvenience will be practically reduced and removed. Now it is three months since the Tramways stopped running. The Government are now considering to notify and take away the power given to them and cancel the licence given to the Tramways. Meanwhile the company has approached the Corporation and the Mayor with some proposals. One was for the Corporation to purchase the company property, etc. I had a discussion this morning with the Mayor and he said that the Corporation were not prepared to purchase the company. The Corporation knew that it would be a very heavily losing concern and that they had to provide other amenities before they could think of running the trams. The alternative proposal was, just like in Bengal, when the company is running the trams without any financial obligations to the Government but on certain agreed arrangement, in the name of the Government, to adopt a similar system, in the name of Corporation, and that is under active consideration of both the Corporation and the Government also. The whole problem is to be examined in detail and if there are no financial obligations or losses to be incurred by the Corporation perhaps the Government after close scrutiny may permit the Corporation to lend their name to run the Tramways by the company itself.''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' The time allotted for this debate is over. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 9-30 a.m. to-morrow.''

The House then adjourned.

VIII.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* *Extension of Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Act to certain areas of Chidambaram and Cuddalore taluks in South Arcot district—G.O. Ms No.* 1769, *Revenue, dated the 24th June* 1953. *(Laid on the table under sub-sections* **(1)** *and* **(2)** ***of section* 15 *of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Act,* 1952.)**

---

* Laid on the table on 14th July 1953.